



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,992	09/10/2003	Matthew Towler	7443 US	5558
36078	7590	09/17/2009		
MATTHEW D. RABDAU			EXAMINER	
TEKTRONIX, INC.			ANYIKIRE, CHIKAO DILIE	
14150 S.W. KARL BRAUN DRIVE				
P.O. BOX 500 (50-LAW)			ART UNIT	
BEAVERTON, OR 97077-0001			PAPER NUMBER	
			2621	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			09/17/2009	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,992

Applicant(s)

TOWLER, MATTHEW

Examiner

CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE

Art Unit

2621

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is responsive to application number (10658992) filed on September 10, 2003. Claims 1-22 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments see Remarks, filed June 02, 2009, with respect to claims 1-22 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Non-final Rejection of February 06, 2009 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1-2, 4-10, and 13-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi (US 6,473,129) in view of Taniguchi et al (US 6,445,679).

As per **claim 1**, Taniguchi et al disclose a method of monitoring a transport stream of a compressed video signal comprising the steps of:

extracting an information element from the transport stream (column 4 lines 59 - column 5 line 2; Choi discloses that an ESI element is extracted from the transport stream);

generating (Fig 2, 20) a message of a predetermined type dependent on the extracted information element (column 5 lines 2-37; the various types of msgs that are generated from information elements);

assigning a priority to the message, the priority being dependent on a predetermined criticality of the predetermined type to the integrity of the compressed video signal (column 5 lines 46-62);

However, Choi does not explicitly teach adding the message to a message queue if the priority of the message exceeds a variable threshold priority level;

adjusting the variable threshold priority level in dependence upon whether a size of the message queue is within a predetermined range to obtain an adjusted variable threshold priority level, discarding messages in the message queue having a priority less than the adjusted variable threshold priority level; and

analyzing a next message from the message queue according to the predetermined type of the next message.

In the same field of endeavor, Taniguchi teaches adding the message to a message queue if the priority of the message exceeds a variable threshold priority level (Col 15 Ln 6-16);

adjusting the variable threshold priority level in dependence upon whether a size of the message queue is within a predetermined range to obtain an adjusted variable threshold priority level, discarding messages in the message queue having a priority less than the adjusted variable threshold priority level (Col 17 Ln 17-24); and

analyzing a next message from the message queue according to the predetermined type of the next message (Col 26 Ln 25-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Choi with Taniguchi. The advantage of this modification is a prevention of overloading a system.

As per **claim 2**, Taniguchi et al disclose the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the adjusting step comprises the steps of:

increasing the variable threshold priority level to a higher level as the adjusted variable threshold priority level if a size of the message queue exceeds a predetermined maximum size (Col 18 Ln 17-35);

discarding the messages in the message queue having a priority less than the adjusted variable threshold priority level (Col 27 Ln 62 – Col 28 Ln 4; the prior art shows that higher the priority the lower the value and therefore discards the message if it is lower than the threshold); and

otherwise reducing the variable threshold priority level to a lower level as the adjusted variable threshold priority level if the size of the message queue is less than a predetermined minimum size (Col 18 Ln 17-35).

As per **claim 4**, Taniguchi et al disclose the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the analyzing step (Fig 4, 25) comprises the steps of:

registering as to which predetermined types of messages each analyzer module of a plurality of analyzer modules processes (Col 10 Ln 40 – Col 11 Ln 28);

determining the predetermined type of the next message (Col 10 Ln 40 – Col 11 Ln 28); and

dispatching the next message to at least one of the analyzer modules which is registered to process the predetermined type of the next message (Col 10 Ln 40 – Col 11 Ln 28).

As per **claim 5**, Taniguchi et al disclose the method as recited in claim 4 wherein the adjusting step comprises the step of informing each of the analyzer modules which is registered to process the predetermined types of messages when there is a change (Col 10 Ln 40 – Col 11 Ln 28).

As per **claim 6**, Taniguchi et al disclose the method as recited in claim 1 further comprising the step of outputting results of the analyzing step to a user interface (Col 7 Ln 60-61 and Col 8 Ln 25-33).

As per **claim 7**, Taniguchi et al disclose the method as recited in claim 1 further comprising the step of logging results of the analyzing step (Col 8 Ln 25-33).

Regarding **claim 8**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable for claim 8.

Regarding **claim 9**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2 are applicable for claim 9.

Regarding **claim 10**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable for claim 10.

Regarding **claim 13**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6 are applicable for claim 13.

Regarding **claim 14**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7 are applicable for claim 14.

6. Claims 15-18 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi (US 6,473,129) in view of Taniguchi et al (US 6,445,679) in further view of Kaneko et al (US 6,505,347)..

As per **claim 15**, Choi disclose the method as recited in claim 1.

However, Choi does not explicitly teach identifying from the messages in the message queue a program association table having a list of packet identifiers of program map tables associated with each of a plurality of programs in the transport stream;

generating from the program association table a checklist having members representative of respective ones of the packet identifiers in the program map tables in the transport stream and the associated programs; and

analyzing the messages to detect the program map tables to determine whether for each member of the checklist there is a program map table packet identifier for the associated program.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaneko et al teach identifying (Fig 4, 21) from the messages in the message queue a program association table having a list of packet identifiers of program map tables associated with each of a plurality of programs in the transport stream (Fig 9, Table 3; Col 13 Ln 56-65);

generating (Fig 4, 25) from the program association table (Fig 9, Table 3, PAT; which contains the contents of a PMT) a checklist having members representative of respective ones of the packet identifiers in the program map tables in the transport stream and the associated programs (Fig 17; Col 16 Ln 62 – Col Ln 17 Ln 10; each PMT contains a identifiers in the transport streams, which can be indicated by the version number); and

analyzing (Fig 4, 25) the messages to detect the program map tables to determine whether for each member of the checklist there is a program map table packet identifier for the associated program (Col 14 Ln 32-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Taniguchi et al in view of Kaneko et al. The motivation is to control information generating apparatus for broadcast systems which is

capable of altering program control information without interrupting a system operation to output audio/video data.

As per **claim 16**, Kaneko et al disclose the method as recited in claim 15 wherein the identifying step comprises the steps of:

detecting (Fig 4, 25) a version change in the program association table from a prior program association table (Col 14 Ln 35-37); and

suspending analysis of the messages for a predetermined period of transport stream time around the program association table in which the version change is detected (Col 14 Ln 32-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Taniguchi et al in view of Kaneko et al. The motivation is to control information generating apparatus for broadcast systems which is capable of altering program control information without interrupting a system operation to output audio/video data.

As per **claim 17**, Kaneko et al disclose the method as recited in claim 15 wherein the identifying step comprises the steps of:

detecting (Fig 4, 25) a version change in the program map table from a prior program map table (Col 14 Ln 35-37); and

suspending analysis of the messages for a predetermined period of transport stream time around the program map table in which the version change is detected (Col 14 Ln 32-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Taniguchi et al in view of Kaneko et al. The motivation is to control information generating apparatus for broadcast systems which is capable of altering program control information without interrupting a system operation to output audio/video data.

As per **claim 18**, Kaneko et al disclose the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the analyzing means comprises the steps of:

identifying (Fig 4, 21) from the messages in the message queue a program association table (Fig 9, Table 3, PAT; which contains the contents of a PMT) having a transport stream identifier and a plurality of program numbers with each of the programs numbers being associated with one of a respective program in the transport stream (Fig 9, Table 3; Col 13 Ln 56-65);

generating from the program association table a checklist of members representative of the respective program numbers (Fig 17; Col 16 Ln 62 – Col Ln 17 Ln 10; each PMT contains a identifiers in the transport streams, which can be indicated by the version numbers);

analyzing the messages to detect a service description table having a transport identifier and a second plurality of program numbers and associated program descriptions (Col 14 Ln 32-57); and

determining whether for each member of the transport stream for the transport stream identifier corresponding to the service description table (Fig 9, Table 3, SDT)

there is a program number and program description in the service description table (Col 14 Ln 32-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Taniguchi et al in view of Kaneko et al. The motivation is to control information generating apparatus for broadcast systems which is capable of altering program control information without interrupting a system operation to output audio/video data.

As per **claim 22**, Kaneko et al disclose the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the analyzing step comprises the steps of:

identifying from the messages in the message queue a master guide table having a transport stream identifier and a list of event information tables of programs transmitted in the transport stream in consecutive periods of time (Fig 4, 25; Col 13 Ln 56-65);

analyzing the master guide table to determine the presence or absence of a terrestrial transport stream identifier and, if present, the presence or absence of a predetermined number of event information tables including a current event information table of programs currently being transmitted (Col 14 Ln 32-57); and

outputting signals representative of results of the analysis to the user interface (Col 14 Ln 47-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Taniguchi et al in view of Kaneko et al. The motivation is to control information generating apparatus for broadcast systems which is

capable of altering program control information without interrupting a system operation to output audio/video data.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3, 11-12, and 19-21 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272 - 7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621
/Chikaodili Anyikire/
Patent Examiner, AU 2621